

## REMARKS

## BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, and 10 are pending. All claims have been rejected. No claims have been amended or cancelled herein. Reconsideration of all rejected claims is requested.

**I. Objection to the Drawings**

The drawings were objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a) as not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims. The office action states that the drawings do not show the frequency limitations of claims 1, 2, and 10. The applicant respectfully disagrees and contends that the best way of showing the frequency limitations is shown in Fig. 2. Should the examiner disagree with the applicant, the applicant requests input as how to better show the frequency limitations.

The frequency limitations of claim 1 are the wobble signal and the frequency of the circuit. It is noted in claim 1 that the wobble signal has inversions, wherein the inversions are detected by the circuit. An exemplary illustration of a wobble signal in the time domain is shown in Fig. 2 and is labeled as "input wobble signal". As shown, the wobble signal, but for the wobble inversions, is sinusoidal, which corresponds to a single frequency in the frequency domain. Thus, the circuit of claim 1 is tuned to a frequency that is not the frequency of the sine wave of Fig. 2.

When the wobble inversion is input to the circuit, the output of the circuit changes because the wobble inversion includes frequencies other than the frequency or frequencies of the wobble signal. An example of this output is shown in Fig. 2.

With regard to claim 2, the example of the wobble signal of Fig. 2 is monotone, except for the wobble inversion. With regard to claim 10, the applicant respectfully believes that the description would enable one skilled in the art to practice claim 10.

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY****II. Double Patenting Rejection Over Patent 6,614,705**

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, and 10 were subject to a double patenting rejection. A terminal disclaimer has been filed herewith. Therefore, the rejection has been overcome.

**III. Double Patenting Rejection Over Patent 6,614,705**

Claims 4, 5, and 10 were subject to a double patenting rejection over patent 6,798,724. The applicant notes that the office action mistyped the patent as 6,708,724. A terminal disclaimer has been filed herewith to overcome this rejection.


In view of the above, all of the pending claims are now believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

KLAAS, LAW, O'MEARA & MALKIN, P.C.

Dated: December 16, 2005

By:

  
Robert W. Nelson  
Reg. No. 37,898  
1999 Broadway, Suite 2225  
Denver, CO 80202  
Tel: (303) 298-9888  
Fax: (303) 297-2266

Case No. 10001059-3

3